

Remarks/Arguments

This Amendment, accompanied with a Request for Continued Examination, comes in response to the Final Office action of April 14, 2005. The claims have been amended not because it is believed that the new reference cited by the examiner discloses what was claimed, but rather to more definitely highlight the differences between the claimed invention and the reference. Most of the claims have been amended and four new claims added.

Referring to the newly cited reference, U.S. Patent No. 6,039,755 issued to Edwin et al., is nothing like the present invention. Both the Edwin methods of making and the resulting product of Edwin are different. With respect to the making of the articles, Edwin's processes (see Cols. 9 and 10) are completely different than those disclosed in the present invention (see the specification). In fact, Edwin uses only one PTFE resin at a time. It is, of course, fundamental to the processes of the present invention that two resins be used. This difference vitiates the findings of the examiner under MPEP 2112 because these findings require making by the same process.

Review of Edwin also reveals resulting structures are starkly different. See, e.g., the illustration of FIG. 2 and all of the micrographs referenced by the examiner. All of these images show articles having uniform internodal distances between elongated nodes. Even beyond that, this uniformity is the chief objective of the patent. See Col. 10 lines 10-30 and claims 1 and 14. There is no mention of distinct groups of pores. Any deviations in Edwin's micrographs which stray from uniform internodal distances are an aberration contrary to the goals of the patent. See Col. 10 lines 10-30.

Nowhere does Edwin disclose using two PTFE resins that expand differently to create the article. Nor does Edwin describe a structure within a structure. Much less any

consistent pattern of discretely-sized pores. The Edwin pores are instead radically orientated and unintentional.

Because the Examiner has failed to show all the claimed limitations it is respectfully suggested that the Examiner's rejections should be withdrawn, and this application passed on to issue. Applicant does not believe that any fee is due with this amendment. However, if Applicant is mistaken, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct any required fee from Deposit Account 19-2112. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this case, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,



Marshall S. Honeyman
Reg. No. 48,114

MSH/tjd

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
(816) 474-6550, ext. 16037

THE COMMISSIONER IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO
CHARGE ANY ADDITIONAL AMOUNT REQUIRED,
OR CREDIT ANY OVERPAYMENT, TO ACCOUNT
NO. 19-2112.